

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Claims 12-14 and 23 are pending in the application, with claim 12 being the independent claim. Claims 1-11 and 15-22 are withdrawn without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objection to the Specification

With no supporting explanation, the Examiner objected to the title of the invention as being not descriptive. Applicant respectfully disagrees. MPEP section 606 states that the title of the invention be "brief but technically accurate and descriptive." Applicant believes this requirement has been met. The title of the invention is OVERLAY CORRECTION BY REDUCING WAFER SLIPPING AFTER ALIGNMENT, and independent claim 12 recites a lithography system "configured to reduce wafer slipping." This is accomplished, as recited in claim 12, by creating "an initial stress at an interface between the wafer and the wafer chuck." For this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn. If the Examiner disagrees, then Applicant respectfully requests an explanation as to why the current title is either technically inaccurate or not descriptive.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected independent claim 12 and dependent claims 13, 14 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,744,550 to Oglesbee

("Oglesbee"). Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

More specifically, the Examiner has mischaracterized Oglesbee in applying it to the pending claims. Oglesbee is directed to a wafer holder wherein a diced wafer (7) is placed on a flexible film (5). (Oglesbee, col. 3, ll. 62-65.) The flexible film (5) is stretched over a vacuum groove (25). (Oglesbee, col. 3, ll. 40-50.) When a vacuum is applied to vacuum groove (25), the diced portions of the wafer (7) separate to permit "inspection and processing." (Oglesbee, FIGs. 5-7; col. 1, ll. 40-41.)

In applying Oglesbee to independent claim 12, the Examiner attempts to equate the flexible film (5) to a "wafer chuck," and the brace or bracket member (3) to an "expander." Further, the Examiner asserts without explanation that the bracket member (3) and the flexible film (5) "create an inherent initial stress at an interface between the wafer 7 and the wafer chuck 5." (Office Action, p. 3.)

Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of Oglesbee. The diced wafer in Oglesbee is loosely placed on a flexible film and the film is expanded using a vacuum force as described above. Applicant asserts that no "*initial stress at an interface between the wafer and the wafer chuck*" is accomplished in Oglesbee. Such an "*initial stress*" could only be accomplished with the apparatus shown in Oglesbee if the diced wafer were firmly attached to a pre-stretched flexible film, and the flexible film were then relaxed. Attaching the diced wafer to the film in this manner would utterly defeat the purpose of Oglesbee. Indeed, attaching a diced wafer to the film in this fashion would make the inspection action illustrated in FIG. 7 of Oglesbee impossible.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent 12 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Dependent claims 13, 14 and 23 depend from patentable claim 12. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of dependent claims 13, 14 and 23 also be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jon E. Wright
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 50,720

Date: September 7, 2006

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

568779_1.DOC